

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 345 678

HE 025 591

AUTHOR Scott, Robert A.
TITLE Campus Developments in Response to the Challenges of Internationalization: The Case of Ramapo College of New Jersey (USA).
PUB DATE Sep 92
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the General Conference, Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (Paris, France, September 2, 1992). Paris, France).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Evaluation; *Campuses; *Change Strategies; Curriculum Development; Educational Change; *Global Approach; Higher Education; *International Education; Mission Statements; *Multicultural Education; Program Evaluation; Resistance to Change; Speeches
IDENTIFIERS *Ramapo College of New Jersey

ABSTRACT

This document presents the text of a speech given by the President of Ramapo College (New Jersey) on campus responses to the imperatives for global education. A section laying out the principles for internationalizing institutions describes the strategies used at Ramapo College which includes multicultural and international themes pervasive throughout the curriculum, efforts in all areas of campus life, a strategic mission embracing research and training, and initiative development through partnerships with other institutions. Points of leverage for global education is covered next including the campus mission statement, strategic plans, and academic program and administrative unit reviews. A discussion of strategies for overcoming barriers rejects international education for reasons of economic competitiveness or for casting others as victims. Rather, the paper argues, the goal of international education, must be to enhance the abilities of students to learn and pursue truth on their own and in groups in such a way that they can better understand themselves in relation to others. The following section emphasizes the complexity of the issues in international and multicultural education and suggests ways to approach them. Criteria for assessing program impact, a summary of progress to date, and reflections on the Ramapo experience conclude the speech. (JB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

**CAMPUS DEVELOPMENTS IN RESPONSE TO THE
CHALLENGES OF INTERNATIONALIZATION:
THE CASE OF RAMAPO COLLEGE OF NEW JERSEY (USA)**

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert A. Scott

by

Robert A. Scott, President
Ramapo College of New Jersey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) "

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

Introduction

We know the imperatives for global education, and they are not new. They just keep growing in number. Economic competitiveness is an imperative; environmental interdependence is an imperative; the increasing ethnic and religious diversity of our towns and schools is an imperative; the fact that many of our citizens work for global or foreign-owned firms is an imperative; the fact that even small businesses must deal with issues of international trade, currency, and products is an imperative; the fact that our college graduates likely will be supervised by or will supervise persons of different racial, ethnic, and nationality groups is an imperative; and yes, national security and peaceful, respectful relations between nations is an imperative. Therefore, our education should prepare students to think and pursue truth on their own and in groups in an increasingly interdependent and multicultural world.

Invited presentation at the 1992 General Conference, Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education (IMHE) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Paris, France, September 2, 1992. Based in part on previous presentations, especially "Strategies for Internationalizing Campus and Curriculum," AASCU, 1991.

HE025 591

How do we respond to these imperatives? Do we emphasize process or content, skills or concepts, current courses or new and specialized curricula? How should we use interactive computing and telecommunications to connect schools, colleges, and businesses in this country, and make connections with educational partners in other regions of the world? How do we ensure that an emphasis on global literacy doesn't fan the flames of romance about a foreign culture, but ignore the diversity in our own communities? How do we provide the necessary preparation for current and future teachers and professors? How do we encourage teacher involvement in study and travel in non-Western as well as in Western areas of the world? Of what use is foreign language study in high school or college if students don't have the opportunity to use the language? Which languages should we choose to teach - those important to our state's economic development and international trade strategy, or those chosen because of area populations? In which case will students have the greater opportunity to use their second language proficiency?

How can we be sure that we don't confuse global literacy and the kind of value-void acceptance of ideology described by Diane Ravitch? Or, as she put it elsewhere, how can we be sure we won't sacrifice multiculturalism for a new form of particularism? How can we balance the goals of global literacy and the need for basic skills, two essential ingredients of education which sometimes are thought to be in opposition: with international studies for the suburban elite and basic skills for the urban poor? Can't both needs be tied to the goals of raising student aspirations, reducing attrition, improving attainment, and preparing students for an increasingly interdependent and multicultural world?

During the last several years, it often seemed as if every college and university in the United States, and nearly every higher education association, had become a champion for international education. In 1987, 165 education organizations, many of which had never before found common cause, joined together to create CAFLIS, the Coalition for the Advancement of Foreign Languages and International Studies. The mission of CAFLIS was "to create an action plan aimed at improving the ability of Americans to operate in the international arena and to understand its importance to America's future."¹ To advance this action plan, CAFLIS issued recommendations to the federal government, educational institutions, state and local policy makers, and business-educational collaborators. The most

¹ "The CAFLIS Action Plan." Robert M. Rosenzweig, Educational Record, Spring, 1990, p. 13.

prominent of its recommendations was the creation of a national endowment, similar to the National Science Foundation, to serve as an instrument "for distilling and expressing important national interests" in the area of foreign languages and international studies.² In a very real sense, CAFLIS reflected the interests of every collegiate institution.

This seems only natural. Institutions support international education. Three-fourths (77%) of all four-year colleges and almost one-half (46%) of two-year colleges offer "at least one internationally oriented course in general education requirements."³ Nearly two-thirds of all four-year colleges have at least one study abroad program of their own.⁴ And more than 400,000 students from other countries study in the United States each year at campuses from coast to coast.

However, despite these signs of concern and progress, the results are unimpressive. The great majority of four-year institutions (84%) and two-year institutions (97%) have no foreign language requirement for entrance.⁵ Less than 10% of high school students enroll in four years of a foreign language.⁶ And relatively few institutions require all students to study a foreign language before graduation.⁷ In fact, the U.S. continues to be one of the few nations in the world where a student can graduate from college without ever studying a second language.⁸

² Ibid.

³ Lambert, Richard D., International Studies and the Undergraduate. American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1989, p. 109.

⁴ Ibid., p. 11.

⁵ Lambert, p. 62.

⁶ America in Transition, p. 4.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ "What We Can't Say Can Hurt Us: A Call for Foreign Language Competence by the Year 2000." American Council on Education, Washington, D.C. 1989, p. 10.

Equally distressing is the fact that "less than 2% (about 50,000; 70,000 in 1992-92) of the 12.2 million U.S. college and university students study abroad for credit."⁹ The European Economic Community has created a program (ERASMUS, European Action Scheme for Mobility of University Students) which will add three times that number to the ranks of European students studying in another country every year. Its goal is 10% of European university students per year.

Why haven't we made more progress? The calls to action are numerous and clear. The National Governors' Association said, "All college and university graduates **must** be knowledgeable about the broader world and conversant in another language."¹⁰ The American Council on Education has called for all colleges and universities to "set goals for foreign language competence by the year 2000."¹¹

The answers are not simple, of course. Foreign language instruction, study abroad programs, and courses with international content must all compete for priority and resources with courses and programs of more immediate interest to both faculty and students. Change takes will and time and, sometimes, money. Nevertheless, a number of colleges and universities have made significant progress in making the campus more global. In my view, the common ingredients at each are the commitment of the board of trustees and the president, and a clear set of objectives.

The objectives for global education at these colleges and universities seem clear and are well-expressed by the Atlantic Council:

- ° To provide students with a sense of time and place.
- ° To challenge students to appreciate the complexity of issues and interests that bear on the relations among nations, regions, and power groups.

⁹ Exchange 2000: International Leadership for the Next Century. A Report to the Nation on the Role of International Exchange Programs in Meeting United States and Global Needs at the Turn of the Century. The Liaison Group for International Education Exchange, Washington, D.C., 1990, p. 6.

¹⁰ America in Transition, p. vii.

¹¹ "What We Can't Say Can Hurt Us," p. 3.

- ° To prepare students to take account of the new and changing phenomena that affect international relations.
- ° To encourage critical thinking and inquiry about contending concepts and theories of international relations.
- ° To "de-parochialize" students' perspectives on international affairs.
- ° To heighten understanding that international relations are not static but subject to constant change.¹²

The imperatives are compelling. The objectives are clear. How do we turn imperatives and objectives into priorities? What are the principles for guiding campus decisions? What is a useful framework for organizing activities and evaluating progress? What are the points of leverage for action? What initiatives should we advocate?

Principles for Internationalizing the Institution

The principles to be used for internationalizing any particular campus will depend upon the goals and objectives established. Will the areas of emphasis be general education, selected majors, area studies, or foreign language proficiency and culture, which are often optional choices for students? Or will the goal be to make global education pervasive throughout the curriculum and extracurriculum in order to affect all students? Is the goal based on an institutional desire to keep up with fundamental industrial, technological and social trends in the U.S., or on a need for competitive advantage, or distinctiveness, compared to other institutions?

At Ramapo college, a public undergraduate college of liberal arts, science, and professional studies, and 4700 students, we developed a strategy that gives emphasis to the international and multicultural dimensions of nearly all fields of study for reasons of institutional mission, strategy, and distinctiveness.

¹² Post World War II International Relations as a component of General Education in American Colleges and Universities. The Atlantic Council of the United States, Washington, D.C. 1989, p. 7.

International and multicultural education was chosen as the strategic direction for Ramapo in 1985 not only because the new president believed strongly that every college graduate should be "globally" literate and the recipient of an education based on the liberal arts, but also because Ramapo College has a distinct set of strengths and opportunities. These distinctive features include faculty expertise, student backgrounds, and neighboring international firms, the presence of which suggested that this should be the direction to take in strengthening institutional distinctiveness, attractiveness, enrollment, and resources.

In developing a strategy, it is necessary not only to assess assets and opportunities, but also to develop a set of principles for decision-making. At Ramapo we decided on the following principles to guide us in developing our identity as the "college of choice for a global education."

1. We decided that our strategy should include both international and multicultural themes. After all, the U.S. is part of the world, and we have a great diversity of ethnic, racial, and national groups in our midst. It is just as important for our students to understand the cultural diversity of American society as it is for them to appreciate diversity in the world. Many people seem to think that "international" refers to those "over there", while "multicultural" refers to populations in our own towns, cities, or neighborhoods. We use "global" to cover both terms--international and multicultural or intercultural. Our goal is to provide an excellent preparation for graduates as citizens and professionals in an increasingly interdependent and intercultural world.
2. We also decided that our theme of international and intercultural education should be pervasive throughout the curriculum, in remedial and developmental courses, general education and area studies, and liberal arts majors, as well as professional studies such as accounting. (After all, if accounting is the systematic assignment of value to assets, and if values and assets differ around the world, then our business students should study comparative accounting as well as international marketing. They do.) We decided on an integrative approach that would make it possible for all programs to be included and would not limit our efforts to particular majors.
3. The Ramapo strategy includes the extracurriculum as well as the curriculum, courses in subject matter as well as in skill areas. Our efforts touch all areas of campus life, including housing, urban internships, field study, cooperative education, and study abroad as well as student and faculty exchanges, visiting

international and minority scholars, the use of computing and telecommunications, etc.

4. Our strategic mission embraces research and training as well as undergraduate teaching. There is an important role for our faculty to play through its scholarly and artistic activities and its work with graduate students through joint programs with the New Jersey Institute of Technology, New York University, Rutgers, and the University of Medicine and Dentistry in addition to the state's Minority Academic Careers program.
5. Our initiatives are being developed through campus expertise as well as through partnerships with others, including universities, community colleges, schools, communities, cultural organizations, and corporations whose expertise lies in different areas. In this manner, the sum of what we do can be greater than the total of the individual parts.

It should be obvious that faculty renewal and development is essential to these objectives, and underlies these principles.

Points of Leverage for Action.

The points of leverage to raise institutional priority for global education in the curriculum and extracurriculum are the same for every campus, although those employed will vary by circumstance. The key actors in employing these points of leverage will vary as well. They may be the trustees, the president, the academic vice president, a dean, a department chair, a faculty member, all of the above, or some combination. The first step is for the international education advocate to persuade one or more of these key actors that the imperatives for global education should affect institutional objectives. Once this occurs, the global education prophets can use the points of leverage found in every institution to ensure that international education's priority is sustained or even increased.

The eleven major points of leverage are known to all: the mission statement; the strategic plan; annual academic program and administrative unit reviews; annual goals and objectives for senior officers, including deans; annual budget requests and allocations; staffing decisions; funds for faculty and curriculum development; annual awards, rewards and other forms of recognition for meritorious service, including honorary degrees; the Trustees' agenda; five and ten-year regional accrediting self-studies, and fundraising in both public and private sectors. Basically, the advocate of higher priority for global education wants to ensure that it is a

central part of the discussion when any of these points of leverage are employed. I think the reason is obvious. They provide the opportunity to ensure that priority follows imperative.

The campus mission statement is the institutional expression of educational goals and outcomes; it expresses campus vision, purpose and values. Therefore, it is referenced during discussions of priorities. For international education to be mentioned in the mission statement is the first step toward higher priority. And, as we all know from campus exercises in writing mission statements, these opportunities are available.

Strategic plans include sections on institutional strengths, weaknesses, challenges, opportunities, and both on-campus and off-campus forces for change. The "imperatives" cited earlier make it highly likely that international and multicultural education can gain prominent mention in the strategic plan's environmental scan.

Annual academic program and administrative unit reviews should always refer to the mission statement and strategic plan, thus providing an opportunity to assess the degree to which academic programs and administrative units support international and multicultural education and set goals and objectives related to global awareness.

Other points of leverage are used in the same way -- with reference to the mission statement and strategic plan -- to enhance the priority for global education. The technique works, whether the leverage is the annual goals and objectives of senior officers and deans; annual budget requests and allocations; staffing decisions; the use of funds for faculty and curriculum development; annual awards for promotion, tenure, salary, excellence in teaching or scholarship, or recognition for distinguished achievement in a profession; Trustees' agendas; self-studies for accreditation (especially given the concern of accrediting associations for issues of equity, diversity, multicultural education, and outcomes assessment), or the fundraiser's case statement, which itself is drawn from the mission and strategic plan. These two documents, often ignored by faculty, are most susceptible to the persuasiveness of the "imperatives," and drive institutional priorities.

This review of the points of leverage is not intended to make it sound easy; it is not. And of course there are other priorities which claim attention in the mission statement and can use

the points of leverage to gain priority. But this systematic approach enhances the possibilities for change, and for global education to receive priority.

These eleven major points of decision, and others we could enumerate, offer prime opportunities to express and support campus priorities. These are the points of leverage for institutional change. On each occasion, we should express our commitment to educational objectives that acknowledge the world our graduates will face and the state and national imperatives for global understanding.

So much for a general approach to strategy development. What about a particular campus?

As stated earlier, interest in the international, or global, aspects of education is not new. There have been strong advocates for global education for many years. What is new is the broadening of the term "global" to include multicultural as well as international education, and the convergence of interests as expressed by educators, business and political leaders, and students. The goal is not "international education" alone, but education for an increasingly interdependent and multicultural world, the world our graduates will face, with employees, supervisors, and neighbors from different racial, ethnic, and national backgrounds.

Roadblocks and Strategies

But aren't there roadblocks to such developments? Aren't there structural impediments to change? Doesn't faculty inertia inhibit change? Isn't money the lubricant of change, and isn't it in short supply, even for a noble cause such as international and multicultural education? Aren't there philosophical barriers to overcome?

The answer to each question can be "yes," of course. But for reasons of institutional quality and competitiveness, as well as for reasons of educational philosophy -- and for all the other reasons cited earlier -- colleges and universities must incorporate the international and multicultural dimensions of various fields of study into the curriculum as a matter of priority.

The fact is that all of our graduates must be educated in content, *i.e.*, knowledge gained through intensive study of both their own culture and a culture other than their own; skills gained through requirements in language, quantitative reasoning, communications, and

computing; and abilities, including leadership and interpersonal relationships gained through both the curriculum and extracurriculum, for a new world society to be a reality. This formation is not only self-evident, but also verified by employers throughout the country. We have students tell us they receive offers of employment because of the experience in other cultures they gained through Ramapo programs. Employers say the same.

This formulation of knowledge, skills, and abilities in relation to the increasing interdependence of peoples is important to consider not only as a philosophical rationale for our approach to undergraduate education. It also is important as a set of criteria for evaluating the activities we sponsor to encourage intercultural education.

Imagine, though, the activities created or endorsed on many campuses in the name of international and multicultural education. Think of how columnists, politicians, and many college students and faculty view these themes because of how our college leaders portray them.

In the eyes of many, international education and multicultural education "glorify" the lives and heritage of others while containing actual or veiled criticisms of our nation's past. To many, international education is needed for reasons of economic competition, and multicultural education is needed for reasons of guilt, with those to be studied portrayed as victims. In both cases, the student is posed as *voyeur*, looking in without understanding the "other" in relation to himself, or herself in relation to the other. How else can we explain the fact that on many campuses, international programming is principally related to business and economics, with student exchanges in mostly English-speaking countries, and on many others "multicultural" programming is devoted to the subject as victim or to separating students by background? Look at the course titles in the humanities at many colleges for examples. What do these approaches have to do with the "increasing interdependence" of peoples cited in the rationale for a more global education?

The goal of an education for this emerging world should be to understand ourselves, *i.e.*, our knowledge, values, and beliefs, in relation to others, and others in relation to ourselves. Our students must not only master content and skills, but also develop attitudes of respect and concern for others. How can we accomplish this if we deny the heritage of where we live, and compete for "victim" status?

At a recent meeting of university leaders from Asian and Pacific Rim countries, this point was made in a different way. The executive director of an association of southeast Asian universities asserted that Americans are interested in international education for reasons of economic competition, and that Asians are interested in international education for reasons of mutual respect and cooperation. While the assertion may be overstated, there is some truth to it. Most U.S. educators seem to advocate international education for career and other self-serving reasons. And they endorse multicultural education as a palliative, not because it has something important to say.

The Goal of Education and the Role of Diversity

The goal of education must be to enhance the abilities of students to learn and pursue truth on their own and in groups. The reason for emphasizing global or "intercultural" education is to help ensure that students have the ability to understand themselves in relation to those who are from different backgrounds, and of understanding others in relation to themselves. To accomplish this, we need to study differences by making comparisons in many dimensions. To ignore beliefs and values, customs and institutions, both over time and from place to place,¹³ and only to dwell on the unfortunate and painful though true past of a people, is to make it seem as if human nature is the same everywhere, that only the form of "colonial" rule is different. This is short-sighted. We must move beyond "correcting" history to comprehending it.

According to the anthropologist Clifford Geertz, "the image of a constant human nature independent of time, place, and circumstance, of studies and professions, transient fashions and temporary opinions, may be an illusion, that what (humans are) may be so entangled with where (they are), who (they are), and what (they believe), that (their nature) is inseparable from them. It is precisely the consideration of such a possibility that led to the rise of the concept of culture and the decline of the (Enlightenment's) view of (human nature). ... (humanity) unmodified by the customs of particular places do not in fact exist, (and have) never existed," says Geertz.¹⁴ "This makes the drawing of a line between what is natural,

¹³Geertz, Clifford. "The Impact of the Concept of Culture in the Concept of Man," in The Interpretation of Cultures. New York: Basic Books, p. 35.

¹⁴Ibid.

universal, and constant ... and what is conventional, local, and variable extraordinarily difficult" to discern.¹⁵ The conclusion is that humanity is as various in its essence as it is in its expression. And that goes for "us" as well as for "them."

What Geertz does not make explicit, but which he seems to include in his thinking, is that while "essence" and "expression" vary widely across cultures, there are many commonalities as well -- identification with a group, grounding in a place, acculturation of values and beliefs, the need for respect, safety, and hope.

The historians Will and Ariel Durant certainly underscored those basic truths in their discussion of race in history. In their brilliant critique of "race theory," they trace the impact of invasions, intermarriage, and imitation on the development of various civilizations; the extraordinary accomplishments of those cultures; and the influence of geographical opportunity and economic and political developments -- rather than race -- on those civilizations.

"It is not the race that makes civilization, it is the civilization that makes the people: circumstances geographical, economic, and political create a culture, and the culture creates a human type," or tradition. "In the long run such differences of tradition or type yield to the influence of the environment."¹⁶

Unfortunately, the courses and activities called international education and multicultural education at many colleges seem to deny these conclusions. Instead of aiming to understand the essence as well as the expression of another people, commonalities as well as differences, even of those in our own communities, educators tend to deal in broad generalities. They offer a survey on trade or on exploitation, but not an introduction to what it means to be another -- any "other".

I believe the goal of intercultural education should be for students to attain proficiency or competence, however defined locally, in a culture other than one's own. That is, through learning, experiencing, and communicating, students should attain the knowledge, skills, and

¹⁵Ibid. p. 36

¹⁶"Race and History," in The Lessons of History. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1968.

attitudes necessary to discern the essence of another culture as well as to recognize its expression; and to compare both in deep ways to one's own. To do so, one must attain at least the same level of understanding of one's own culture, in order to be able to discern its essence as well as its expression, its commonalities and differences when compared to others.

But what do many colleges do? They provide a superficial survey of Western history and lump all of African-American heritage into a "Black Studies" course or the 28 days in February. They do the same with Latino heritage and Asian heritage, when they do anything at all. In so doing, they deny our students the opportunity to know the rich diversity of cultures within the African, Latin, and Asian experiences. These educators meld dozens of different "essences" into three forms of "expression," and fail to demand that students put themselves in the position of "other."

There are serious educational consequences that result from these approaches. After all, our own understanding of what we mean by international and multicultural education affects our thinking about campus mission and policies on the curriculum, degree requirements, student and faculty recruitment and retention, affirmative action, and orientation upon arrival at and departure from the college, among other activities.

Complex Issues Made Manageable

It is for these reasons that I say colleges and universities which espouse international and multicultural education often ignore complex issues, including the fact that African-Americans, Asian-Americans, and Latinos are not monolithic groups, as college programming often suggests; that relations between and among these groups, and between and among them and international students and faculty, are often complicated by prejudices brought to this country; and that there are important lessons to be learned by studying ethnic or inter-group relations in other countries.

Too many students think of Africa as a nation instead of as a home of nations. Few students know of the African *diaspora* and the existence of African heritage in scores of countries. With so little understanding, how can they make sense of the term "African-American?"

The same can be said for Asian and Latino heritage. Our students know so little, and often we are to blame. In our courses and in our celebrations, we must peel back the layers of meaning to reveal the richness of diversity.

We are also often to blame for our students' ignorance because we organize our curricula and activities as if the international is bilateral: the U.S. and the Far East; the U.S. and Africa; the U.S. and Latin America, etc. We seem to forget -- except in a few classes -- that other nations have relations between and among themselves independent of the U.S.; that the geographic orientation of countries is not the same around the world (*to wit*, the Far East is not the far east from everyone's perspective), and that inter-group relations forged elsewhere, especially when based on limited awareness and the antagonism over scarce resources, may cause difficulties even in a third country.

The lessons to be learned by studying inter-group relations in other countries seem to be lost on our institutions. Clearly the relations between and among ethnic, national and racial groups in our country can be illuminated by studying inter-group relations in Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America as well as in North America. But why is one the subject of international education, while the other is considered multicultural education? We and our students are of the same world, and need to understand ourselves and others as part of it.

The international and the multicultural are threads in the same cloth. After all, what is multicultural to us is international to others. That is why we must understand ourselves in order to understand others.

One of the advantages and attractions of this approach is that it can be inclusive of all faculty; it is not the exclusive domain of just a few in a precious center of study. But even with these attractions, the change to increased international and multicultural programming requires a strategic plan and process. As with any plan, this strategy requires goals and objectives which attract the professional interests of faculty; an understanding of both mission and markets; a set of principles for the development of new courses and programs, and a planning process which attracts the involvement and commitment of faculty and staff, includes assignments for responsibility and a schedule for deadlines, and a system of evaluation. With expertise identified and commitments understood, funds can be sought with greater assurance. At Ramapo, we can attest to the possibilities.

We established six broad objectives for our efforts, all designed to overcome barriers. These initiatives included (1) professional development for faculty and staff, with funds for travel, books and materials, consultants, visiting scholars, and faculty and staff exchanges as high priorities; (2) curriculum development, including released time for revising current courses and developing new courses, scholarship and creative endeavors; (3) skill development, including languages, computing, international telecommunications capability, teleconferencing, audioconferencing, and televised programming; (4) experiential learning, including theme dorms, study abroad, student and faculty exchanges, urban internships and professional practice through international cooperative education placements; (5) programmatic partnerships with schools, colleges, community organizations and corporations, and (6) the recruitment and retention of students, with particular emphasis on international and minority students.

Criteria for Assessing the Impact of Programs

No matter how limited or pervasive the programming is to be, assessment should be designed into it from the beginning. We need to know the impact of the plan on faculty, the curriculum and extracurriculum, and students. Assessment must be routine.

At the more general level, we need to assess (1) the continuing commitment of the board of trustees and the president to achieving the objectives, especially to the review of how these objectives are related to the mission statement, program reviews, staffing decisions, and budget requests; (2) the role of faculty as the major determinants of the substance and quality of the programs; (3) the recruitment and retention of faculty essential to the programs; (4) the centrality of international and multicultural education to skill, liberal, and professional studies, and (5) the curricular and extracurricular opportunities for students to develop attitudes, skills, and knowledge that prepare them for citizenship and careers.

At a more specific level, we need to assess actual progress toward specific goals and objectives. At Ramapo, this means an assessment of (1) the number of faculty and staff who participate in professional development related to the mission for global education; (2) the consequences of that experience; (3) the number and distribution of courses revised or added and related to global education; (4) enrollment in courses related to these goals and objectives; (5) the development and use of audio and video telecommunications; (6) the

number and quality of study abroad, international cooperative education, student and faculty exchanges, visiting scholars, and urban internship programs; (7) the number of students participating in these programs; (8) the number, quality, and results of partnerships with schools, business and community groups; (9) the number and distribution of minority and international faculty by program, and (10) the number and success of international and minority students recruited and retained.

I think a useful framework for planning and evaluation is a "grid," a matrix with nine cells. The columns are labeled "campus," "curriculum," and "community." The rows, labeled on the left, are "learning," "experiencing," and "communicating." As the reader can visualize, this grid has great potential for planning and evaluation.

By "learning," I include the various sources for students to enhance their knowledge, skills, and attitudes. On campus, this includes the extracurriculum as well as the curriculum. Under curriculum, we include the international as well as the multicultural, the study of a culture other than one's own as well as one's own, to learn by examining commonalities as well as differences.

By "experiencing," I include the involvement of international students and scholars on campus as well as international cooperative education, study abroad, and field work in ethnic communities. Under "communicating," I include telecommunications as well as foreign language instruction and computing.

Brief Summary of Progress to Date

The six broad areas of initiative at Ramapo have specific goals and a formal system of assessment. For example, in the area of faculty development, we set goals for a professional development program for all faculty members. The program helped create a common ground for intellectual discourse on global (*i.e.*, international and multicultural) education, and to enhance faculty expertise. We specifically allocated funds -- and sought new funds -- for this purpose. Additional initiatives toward this goal included faculty seminars on particular areas of the world, such as Latin America, East Asia, and Africa; a research institute; major conferences; new faculty hired in foreign language and area studies; visiting scholars; and

other professional development opportunities, including released time and travel funds for scholarship.

Nearly three-quarters of the full-time faculty participated in the professional development seminars. In addition, about 5% of full-time faculty each year are visiting scholars from other countries, including Fulbright Scholars, an annual scholar supported by the Italian government, Princeton-in-Asia Fellows, and participants in our faculty and foreign scholar exchange programs in Argentina, Volgograd, Puerto Rico, France, Japan, Italy, China, Taiwan, England, Jamaica, and elsewhere. These scholars are from all fields -- sciences, humanities, and social sciences. We also have been approved to participate in the Diplomat-in-Residence Program of the U.S. State Department. By refurbishing an old house on campus, we have created a center for visiting American and international scholars to live and to host seminars in a conducive, "special" setting.

The second major initiative concerned curriculum development. The goal of this initiative was "to infuse international and multicultural dimensions comprehensively throughout the curriculum." Approximately seventy new courses or major revisions of existing courses were produced by faculty participants in the Professional Development Seminar. The new or revised courses are found in the Freshman Seminar Program, developmental reading, general education, honors seminars, new minors and majors, as well as in new language offerings in Italian, Japanese, and Chinese to accompany traditional offerings, which included Russian. In addition, a semester-long lecture series, a weekly television program, and plans for new summer institutes resulted from the curriculum development initiatives.

We still have a long way to go, but foreign language courses have almost quintupled and foreign language enrollments have more than tripled in just a few years. The increase in foreign scholars and international students have helped inspire these increases, both by their presence on campus as well as by their participation in courses as teachers and students. But the general level of expectations and increased opportunities for study abroad also helped increase the number of students studying foreign languages. In support of these language courses, library and media acquisitions were made, and a new language lab facility was constructed.

The major headway in foreign language instruction has been made in Italian. While some on campus urged us to expand Russian or start Chinese, I thought we should start with Italian for students of traditional college age and Japanese for adult American employees of Japanese-owned firms. After all, more than one-third of New Jersey residents are of Italian descent, and Ramapo students fit that same profile. In addition, many thousands of New Jersey residents work as managers for the scores of large Japanese corporations located within a twenty-mile radius of the college. Both languages contribute significantly to our language enrollments. Italian programs include a film and culture series, intensive weekend immersion courses, and study abroad. Japanese programs include international cooperative education, study abroad, and The Japanese Culture Society (a community group serving a "bridge" between American and Japanese families by offering educational, cultural and social programs).

The third goal concerned communications, including specific skills and capabilities in languages, computing, and telecommunications that would enhance the learning and career opportunities of Ramapo students. The centerpiece of this initiative is the International Telecommunications Center, with world-wide satellite capabilities for television reception, audio- and videoconferencing, and broadcast quality television production facilities.

These facilities are used by faculty and students in business, the humanities, social sciences and sciences for course enhancement, and by students in business and communications as subjects of study. Audioconferencing also holds great promise for use in assessing student progress while they are engaged in study or internships in other countries, and for faculty planning study abroad programs. Other facilities include the foreign language laboratory and the "ICONS" (International Communications and Negotiations Simulation) Project Room. During this past year, Ramapo faculty held more than 60 audio and video teleconferences and assisted several major corporations in teleconference productions. In addition, Ramapo now serves the area community college and sixteen school districts by means of fibre optic cable-supported telecourses, and provides Japanese language tutoring to high school students in 19 states as the second national site for The Satellite Educational Resources Consortium (SERC) Japanese program located in Nebraska.

The audio and video conferences provide a means of bringing the world to the classroom, and the classroom to the world. Among other activities, Ramapo students in class held

teleconferences with a University class in Italy discussing the European perspective on American foreign policy during the Gulf War; a group in Cuba discussing freedom of the press; and a local village leader and ecologist in Brazil discussing the ecology of a rain forest. A course matches the reading requirements for a course at Volgograd Pedagogical University with one at Ramapo College, with a teleconference every three to four weeks to allow students to discuss the readings and their observations on the future, including career prospects. This project is certainly enhanced by the fact that the professors and several students have visited the other's institution.

The fourth goal was to expand an already comprehensive program of experiential learning opportunities for all students. These out-of-classroom experiences, guided by both College offices and student clubs, provide a bridge to the world beyond the campus and include a greatly expanded set of study abroad, exchange, and routine teleconference opportunities in England, France, Italy, Israel, Japan, the Soviet Union, Jamaica, Costa Rica, Puerto Rico, Spain, Belgium and Australia. Faculty study tours and visiting scholars add China and Kenya to our world coverage. All of these activities are seen as "building blocks" rather than as capstone experiences.

Each year now five to ten of our faculty and more than 100 students travel abroad for study. We try to design these exchanges so that they result in substantial campus-wide benefits as well as personal enrichment for the individuals involved. We hope that each arrangement continues to expand the opportunities available to faculty and students over time. My goal for international experiences is 100% of students and faculty by the year 2000, using telecommunications as well as in-country exchanges and international cooperative education.

One of the most exciting features of the programs created under our goal for experiential learning is the international cooperative education program. This program permits Ramapo students to work abroad in a salaried position while earning academic credit for a project directed by a Ramapo faculty member and a supervisor in the host country. To date, scores of students, including minority, adult, and disabled students, have participated in international cooperative education placements in six countries, including Russia, Japan, and Norway. As an added attraction, students from these countries can participate in cooperative education in the U. S. while living and studying at Ramapo. The basic premise of the program, of

course, is that if students can find a placement at IBM in Paramus, why not at IBM in Paris. Student expenses are offset by corporate grants and employment.

Experiential education includes extracurricular activities as well as academic study. The Model United Nations debate club competes successfully with Harvard, Georgetown and Army each year; a theme dorm devoted to international concerns adds to the richness of campus life; and students participate in urban area internships and mentoring programs.

The fifth goal concerns the enhancement and extension of Ramapo's outreach activities in international and multicultural programs to area high schools, corporations, other colleges and universities, county colleges, and the general community in northern New Jersey. Ramapo has assumed a leading role in the region by organizing several important and successful programs with local high schools, including the Foreign Policy Consortia of schools, colleges and corporations, and the STAIRS (Students Annual International Relations Seminar) program. Approximately 200 students from 20 high schools participate in STAIRS each year.

We have intensive pre-college partnership programs with urban schools as part of our multicultural concerns. We have shared Fulbright scholars with area schools and colleges; have had a joint Fulbright-Hays Group Projects Abroad Grant for travel to Japan with Kean College; we co-sponsor an archaeological dig in Israel with four other colleges; and now lead a state-sponsored project in collaboration with the Council of New Jersey Consortia for International and Global Education. The Council includes four consortia consisting of 24 colleges and universities, 10 community colleges, and three school districts, as well as numerous professional education associations, state agencies, and community organizations.

We work with Italian as well as Japanese community groups on programs for education and culture, as well as mutual understanding, and with corporate groups in a variety of ways. The International Business major and the International Telecommunications Center have professional advisory boards. In addition, we offer courses and programs on business, language, and culture to American and foreign employees of international and multinational firms. We are partners with Rutgers, the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, and the Department of Commerce in the New Jersey Center for International Business Education. Through all these activities, we have greatly expanded not only our educational activities but also our fund raising potential and results.

The sixth goal concerns the recruitment and retention of students who reflect the multicultural nature of American society as well as students from other countries. During the past few years, Ramapo has experienced a 250% increase in enrollment of foreign students and a 60% increase in minority students. International students now represent about 5% of full-time students. Retention for these students has reached 80%. The same process worked with both groups: set goals, define actions, raise funds for scholarships, monitor progress and refine goals and actions. Ramapo students now come from 15 states and 50 countries.

The recruitment of faculty and staff has also been affected by our concern for international and multicultural education. In addition to the visiting scholars, 40% of new faculty appointments in the past six years have been to minority scholars.

The recruitment of both students and faculty has been assisted by our partnership programs with urban schools such as West Side High School in Newark and our transfer articulation agreements with community colleges which enroll substantial numbers of international and minority students.

For each of these major goals, there are objectives, assignments of responsibility, time tables, and annual, sometimes quarterly, assessments. We have a system of academic program reviews, administrative unit reviews, an internal audit system for operational as well as fiscal matters, and annual performance reviews. We monitor progress toward our goals, with particular concern for student skills, knowledge, awareness, attitudes, and aspirations. We have a special office to assist faculty and staff in seeking corporate, foundation, and government support for our initiatives.

One of the interesting phenomena in the implementation of strategy and the assessment of results is that the more we do, the more we learn. At Ramapo, we continue to extend the frontiers of what we thought possible. Hence, we need to consider new forms and subjects of assessment.

Reflections on the Ramapo Experience

Ramapo's initiatives in global education, both international and multicultural, were greatly assisted by a special three-year grant of \$3.4 million from the State of New Jersey's

Governor's "Challenge for Excellence" Grant Program. We completed this funding in 1989, and, with the assistance of The American Forum for Global Education, reviewed progress in the attainment of goals. The original proposal was structured around a strategic vision that would be followed with or without the extra state assistance and with a four-year financial plan that would show how the initiatives would be continued after the conclusion of the three-year grant period. It was our assumption that the strategic vision was of sufficient merit to attract private funding as well as other sources of public support. Indeed, we have received generous private and federal as well as other state grants to support the initiatives. These grants include support from Becton Dickinson, IBM, Matsushita, Sanyo, Sharp, Sony, and Title VI of the U.S. Department of Education.

The Challenge Grant award was divided into two nearly equal parts, with one-half financing the renovation and equipping of a facility to become our International Telecommunications Center, and one-half for various forms of faculty, staff, and curriculum development, programs for student recruitment and retention, and related outreach efforts. New faculty were added in foreign languages and additional staff were added to the cooperative education program to start the new international cooperative education initiative. At the conclusion of the three-year grant period, the state provided \$750,000 as a permanent addition to the base budget to support high priority initiatives. Private grants enabled us to add the equipment which was deleted from the recommended base budget addition.

There were many unexpected but beneficial consequences of the Challenge Grant support and the initiatives related to it. Furthermore, we underestimated the positive results of the grant. The governor wanted his Challenge Grant program to result in greater distinctiveness and prestige for the State's colleges, and we benefitted far more than we ever thought we would. Some objectives which we thought were tremendously far-sighted and ambitious at the time we developed the proposal have proven to be only somewhat far-sighted, and not quite as ambitious as we probably could have made them. In the area of telecommunications, however, we are far ahead of all but the largest research universities in terms of equipment and capability. In other areas, I wish we had been more ambitious, especially in adding staff for foreign language and humanities programs. However, we asked the state for as much as we thought we could, and were the only grant recipient to receive all that we requested.

Some have described aspects of our Challenge Grant initiatives as "sowing a thousand seeds" and awaiting the results. While we certainly had a more goal-oriented approach than this suggests, there is some truth to the notion of allowing many flowers to bloom before deciding which to cull and which to cultivate. As a result, many individual faculty members established linkages with institutions in other countries, even when it did not seem at all certain that those linkages would build on campus strengths or add to all-college opportunities for faculty and students. The successor organization, the Center for Intercultural Education, has developed clear guidelines and priorities for the continuation and establishment of linkages. Nevertheless, we supported some travel and summer study in countries where it was not clear that sustained programmatic initiatives would result. We took risks, and that was appropriate. We need to encourage faculty to explore possibilities.

The initiatives for international and multicultural education were based on the principles of pervasive programming and institutionalized activities that would become part of the fabric of the institution. We were more interested in making all programs infused by global awareness than in the creation of separate and precious programs. It was interesting, therefore, to realize the importance of having some programs specifically identified as international or multicultural, and as resulting from Challenge Grant support. The two examples to be cited are the program in International Business and the International Coop program. Without these programs, it would be possible for an outsider to review an index of programs and wonder about the impact of the grant. Visible symbols are important to reflect progress, even if they under-represent the degree of progress made.

Through these initiatives, Ramapo has been strengthened, student and faculty aspirations have been raised, retention has been improved, and our education has been enhanced to prepare students more fully to live and work in an increasingly interdependent and multicultural world.

In addition, Ramapo has gained new status in government, business and education circles. When the new Governor wanted to meet senior executives of Japanese firms, he asked us. When the Department of Commerce Division of International Trade wanted advice on international business education, the staff asked Ramapo. Our faculty, staff, and students have received recognition world-wide for their accomplishments.

It is appropriate to wonder whether alternative formats would have been more successful, and a more effective foundation for future development. The pervasive approach which we undertook is not suitable for every institution. However, I believe that our initiatives support the notion that one can affect and improve the education of all students by selective initiatives in programs such as the freshman seminar, general education, and enhanced majors such as that in American Studies -- which views the history of America from the perspective of a visiting scholar from another country -- and the increased emphasis on the history and culture of other peoples throughout traditional majors where appropriate.

The developments traced here are ongoing, but received major funding support between 1985 and 1990. In calendar year 1990--the last half of Fiscal Year 1990 and the first half of Fiscal Year 1991--New Jersey's colleges and universities lost more than 25% of their state support. As a consequence, we had to make some rapid and difficult decisions about the allocation of campus funds. We emphasized audio more than video teleconferences; we reduced staffing and reassigned responsibilities; we eliminated some activities; and temporarily, we reduced support for faculty and staff development and Library and media purchases. Therefore, in addition to making changes by refining earlier initiatives, we actually had to curtail developments. For example, for the foreseeable future, we will limit international coop assignments to those we have already arranged, and won't add new sites. We also will arrange to place students from other institutions for a fee and impose increased charges for coop and study abroad assignments. We also have increased our financial aid budgets, in part to assist student international experiences. We have been able to manage these changes, I believe, because we have an institutional priority, we have a faculty-staff-administration-trustee commitment to a clear set of goals, and our approach is pervasive. Our international and multicultural initiatives are not lodged in one vulnerable office; they are everywhere.

In a curious way, our experience of the past two years may actually help make our initiatives a better model for others. We have learned what we can do with money and without money. We know the ease and low cost of audio conferences as a supplement to the classroom; we know the advantage of international cooperative education as an alternative to study abroad; we know the benefits of partnerships to ensure that the "whole is greater than the sum of its parts;" we know that foundation and corporate grants are available for curriculum change and that new federal initiatives are open. We know that major help is available from the American

Council on Education and other associations. We know that the biggest challenge is to make choices among numerous opportunities.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize three points drawn from these thoughts. First, we as educators must ensure that our students understand the depths of diversity. They must know about commonalities as well as differences, strengths as well as weaknesses, values as well as practices.

Now, I understand there are limits to what we can teach and what we can require. That is why I emphasize that our mission is to enhance the ability of students to learn on their own, and in groups, and why I stress the attainment of mastery in a culture other than one's own. The goal is to understand the "other", any "other" or "stranger," not attempt to offer courses in the extensive array of cultures represented throughout our country. Each college should decide on the limited number of particular cultures it will include, given its location and the demographics of its students.

Second, we educators must ensure that our students understand and appreciate that they are the "other" to many in this world. They must know that we need to know ourselves -- the history, literature, and heroes of the peoples who built our civilization, our institutions and our values -- if we are to understand our commonalities and differences when compared to others. Without this knowledge of others and ourselves, we are left with ignorance, fertile ground for suspicion and fear.

Third, we educators must ensure that our students develop a level of competence in a culture other than their own. Only by knowing our own culture, and by having some degree of mastery of another culture, can one begin to put himself or herself in the boots or shoes or sandals of another. A superficial survey course cannot accomplish this. Not even proficiency in a foreign language studied in the best labs with the best teachers can assure this. And not all students can afford to study for a year in another country, or take the "Grand Tour" upon graduation.

But all colleges can use three strategies to help students gain this knowledge. The first is through the curriculum, courses as well as requirements. The second is through experiences, such as one-month, summer-long, and semester-long periods of study and work in another cultural setting. Cooperative education placements in this and other countries are important parts of this strategy at Ramapo. Finally, telecommunications, especially audioconferencing, can be an inexpensive way to make it possible for students of all backgrounds to discuss similarities and differences with students, village officials, and educators in other settings. "Macro" topics such as democracy quickly are joined by immediate concerns about family and careers when students meet electronically, just as they do when they meet in person. When scheduled several times throughout a semester, these discussions can successfully help students begin to see themselves in another. A start has been made.

Taken together, courses, lectures, field experiences, and electronic meetings can help us and our students see that international and multicultural education are part of the same fabric, complementary measures to prepare graduates for an increasingly interdependent and intercultural world -- here *and* there.